

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 10, and 22 have been amended, and support for these amendments may be found throughout the specification as filed, for example at paragraphs 13-15. No new matter is being added.

Claim 1 is directed to statutory subject matter. For example, amended claim 1 recites the injector is operable to be stored on a computer readable medium. The injector in amended claim 1 is stored on a computer readable medium and therefore, is capable of realizing a real-world application as recited in claim 1. Thus, the removal of the non-statutory subject matter rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is patentable over Calder et al., US Publication No. 2002/0092003. For example, Calder does not teach or suggest redirect code operable to be placed in a memory of the application process by the injector and bypass security in place at a remote computing system as recited in amended claim 1. Claims 10 and 22 recite similar limitations. Nowhere in Calder is the mention of bypassing security, much less bypassing security in place at a remote computing system. In sharp contrast, Calder is directed toward securing an application for execution in an individual computer, and the focus of Calder is on providing additional security to prevent an application from improperly accessing/modifying data on the computer. (Abstract, paragraphs 0077-0078, Step 540 Fig. 5 described in paragraph 0090) Calder merely provides a list of approved networks that an application package running on a computer is allowed to access. (paragraphs 0077-0078) Therefore, it follows that claims 1, 10, and 22 (and its dependent claims) are patentable over Calder.

Combining the teachings of Thomas et al., U.S. Patent 6,148,336, does not alter the above conclusion. Thomas fails to teach or suggest redirect code operable to be placed in a memory of the application process. Specifically, Thomas teaches interception of all network traffic at a lower level than the application. (page 7, lines 32-33) Thus, claims 1, 10, and 22 are patentable over the combination of the cited references, and, hence, claims 2-9, 11-21, and 23-33 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 10, and 22.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present claims are patentable over the cited references. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 19-3140 for any deficiencies of fees.

Respectfully submitted,  
**SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP**

Date: July 22, 2008

/Tarek N. Fahmi/

Tarek N. Fahmi

Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station  
Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
650-798-0320